



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BOTANICAL GAZETTE

JUNE, 1892.

On nomenclature.

SERENO WATSON.

[It was the request of the late Dr. Sereno Watson that the following communication, dictated by him in his last illness, should appear at an early date in the BOTANICAL GAZETTE.—EDS.]

For some time I have had a desire to give expression to my views upon botanical nomenclature. Under the circumstances, I must speak briefly and somewhat dogmatically. In my opinion botany is the science of plants and not the science of names. Nomenclature is only one of those tools which is necessary to botany, and this being the case, points of nomenclature should be subordinated to science.

A principle of botanical convenience has been established by those who prefer one name to another on account of expediency or convenience. This principle should have a great deal of influence. It has been so recognized by the greatest botanists, and from their authority receives great weight. I prefer the word *expediency* as a better term than convenience to designate the principle, that the demands of science override any merely technical claims of priority, etc.

Priority of specific names appears to be based entirely upon one section of the code of 1867. That simply says that when a species is transferred from one genus to another, the specific name is maintained. This principle is usually understood and applied in the way that the oldest specific name has a right in all cases to be retained. It cannot fairly be so interpreted and applied, since it governs only to the extent that this should be the law, but it is not to be made an *ex post facto* law. Thus when a transfer has been made, that ends the matter so far as the choice of a specific name is concerned, and no one is authorized to take up a different name. This practice of retaining the oldest name *under the genus*, no matter what older specific names there may be, was adopted by Dr. Gray in his later years and by the Kew bot-

anists, for the reason that once established and pretty generally recognized, it would avoid the great mass of synonymy, which is being heaped like an incubus upon the science. I must express surprise that Dr. Britton has not considered it his duty to publish the last written words of Dr. Gray which were addressed to him upon this subject and which expressed his positive opinions upon this point.

There is nothing whatever of an ethical character inherent in a name through any priority of publication or position which should render it morally obligatory upon anyone to accept one name rather than another; otherwise it would be applicable or true as well in the case of ordinal names, morphological names, teratological, and every other form of name, to which now no one feels himself bound to apply the law of priority. The application of this law as at present practiced by many botanists, which would make it the one great law of botanical nomenclature, before which every other must yield regardless even of common sense, is a mere form of fetichism exemplified in science. Many instances of the application of this law are not science but are rather superstition.

February 22, 1892.

The North American *Lejeuneæ*.

F. STEPHANI.

In his Descriptive Catalogue of N. A. Hepaticæ Dr. Underwood has collected the names of all *Lejeuneæ* reported to have been found in the United States and Canada. Amongst these are four species, which Taylor published as having come from Cincinnati, while they had been collected on the shores of the Amazon, near the city of Pará, which Taylor believed to be a place in the vicinity of Cincinnati. These four species are *Lej. cyclostipa*, *polyphylla*, *testudinea* and *longiflora*, all of which having been described before, now bear other names. His *Lejeunea calyculata* too is merely the common form of *Lej. clypeata* Schweinitz. There remain only the following species, to which I have added four newly detected plants: *Lej. trifaria* Nees, *Lej. Wrightii* G., *Lej. Cardoti* Steph., *Lej. Underwoodii* Steph. The North American *Lejeuneæ* have to be arranged as follows: